

Appl. No. : **09/826,121**
Filed : **April 4, 2001**

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

A number of claim changes are made herein. As amended, each of the claims are allowable over the cited prior art, as clearly established herein.

Initially, applicant apologizes for any confusion in the previous claim language.

In the "remark" on page 2, as well as the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, the rejection states that the claims are not supported by the originally filed specification. The claims are amended herewith to more distinctly define this subject matter.

According to the disclosure, the different users have a login and password, which the specification calls a unique identification; see for example specification page 6, lines 9-11. This unique identification describes which parts of the customer or product records can be accessed by the requesting party. Read and write capabilities to those records are appropriately provided based on that identification.

Page 6 lines 14-18 explained that the secure login ID or call support representative. provides access to the customer information records. Line 17 describes that this secure ID for a

Appl. No. : **09/826,121**
Filed : **April 4, 2001**

customer support representative will not provide access to the inventory module. However, other users who access the system are in fact given access to the inventory module. Specifically, based on the user's unique ID, the user is given access to some parts of the database but not to other parts of the database. Other users are given access to those other parts of the database. See also the description page 25 lines 6 through 32. The individual's login and password determine which subsets of customer, vendor and database information are accessible by that particular user.

This should obviate the rejection on this ground.

Claims 43-52 stand rejected under 35 USC 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection states that this claim defines pure software. In order to obviate this interpretation, the claim 43 is amended to recite that the operations are carried out by a processor. This obviates the interpretation that this is pure software.

The claims stand rejected under based on obviousness type double patenting based on claims 45-111 of co-pending application 10/416,410. Applicant intends to file a terminal disclaimer to obviate this rejection once the conflicting claims have been patented.

Each of the claims are amended herewith to define more distinctly the subject matter intended to be claimed. According to the amended claims, there are a number of databases and a

Appl. No. : **09/826,121**
Filed : **April 4, 2001**

number of "users" who get access to those databases. A unique identification identifies the users and their access to the different databases. Different users only get access to different subset of the whole database.

Claim 1, for example, defines accessing a customer database which has customer records that track a customer. A first user is identified, and that first user gets access to certain records. A second user is also identified. That second user gets access to different records, including an inventory module. A customer management tool allows access and manipulation of customer and product databases by different representatives.

This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art, and should be allowable thereover.

Each of the dependent claims should be allowable for similar reasons, and as well as on their own merits. For example, claim 2 defines a plurality of modules. The other claims should be allowable on their own merits also.

Claim 29 defines a computer readable medium which has many of the advantages discussed above, and should also be allowable for similar and analogous reasons to those discussed above.

Claim 43 has also been amended, and defines even more detail about the shared database structure which allows different users to access different parts of the database. Claim 43 defines a plurality of modules including a customer interaction module, a return merchandise management module, allowing returns, an

Appl. No. : **09/826,121**
Filed : **April 4, 2001**

administration module, and an inventory management module. The tool allows specific representatives to obtain only parts of the total database information.

This is not disclosed or suggested or otherwise made obvious by the hypothetical combination of prior art.

The following discussion of the scope and contents of the prior art demonstrates the difference between these amended claims and the previously cited prior art.

Henderson teaches a method and system for automated customer service, which relies on a customer using a pin number to access a customer database. Henderson teaches using a service card 200 to obtain time for online service. The service card can be purchased or included with the product, see Henderson's column 5 lines 30-32 and Henderson's column 9. A customer calls the access number to get service from a vendor, and is sent to a menu hierarchy. However, there is no disclosure of the shared kinds of databases which are specific to clients, as claimed. Moreover, Henderson does not disclose separate databases for customer and product that are updated as claimed, for example in claim 1. Henderson does not disclose different access granted to different users based on their user id, as claimed.

The secondary reference to Mikusak discloses a workstation that uses object oriented programming to carry out customer support functions. Many different functions are described, but there is no disclosure of the special kind of shared database

Appl. No. : **09/826,121**
Filed : **April 4, 2001**

where different client representatives receive different information, as now defined by the claims. The rejection apparently relies on the fact that Mikusak includes a plurality of modules. While this is true, the modules in Mikusak do not operate as now claimed.

Kirkpatrick is provided for the purpose of showing that a second client representative can update inventory information at a warehouse. Even assuming that Kirkpatrick shows exactly this, it does not disclose, suggest or otherwise make obvious the subject matter now claimed. The rejection states that Kirkpatrick shows different client representatives who have different access. This language is now changed in a way that obviates the interpretation. As amended, a first user has access to certain things like the ability to return modules and the like. A second user has access to things like inventory. By segregating the access in this way, different users can do different things while having the appropriate degree of access to the database. Kirkpatrick may allow the management tool to carry out certain functions, but does not allow the different types of access as now defined by claim 1 and the other analogous claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be

Appl. No. : **09/826,121**
Filed : **April 4, 2001**

exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that communications such as a telephone interview or email would facilitate disposal of this case, the undersigned respectfully encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned. Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail (using the email address harris@schiplaw.com). I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this response, (other than those concurrently paid via EFS), to Deposit Account No. 50-4376.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/20/08

/Scott C Harris/
Scott C. Harris

Appl. No. : **09/826,121**
Filed : **April 4, 2001**

Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 74162
Scott C. Harris, Esq.
Law Office of Scott C Harris
PO Box 1389
Rancho Santa Fe, Ca 92067
Telephone: (858) 756-7778
Facsimile: (858) 756-7717